

Members

Rep. Greg Porter, Chairperson
Rep. Duane Cheney
Rep. Clyde Kersey
Rep. Robert Hoffman
Rep. Phyllis Pond
Rep. Sue Scholer
Sen. Teresa Lubbers
Sen. Ron Alting
Sen. Kent Adams
Sen. Earline Rogers
Sen. Anita Bowser
Sen. Billie Breaux



INTERIM STUDY COMMITTEE ON EDUCATION ISSUES

Legislative Services Agency
200 West Washington Street, Suite 301
Indianapolis, Indiana 46204-2789
Tel: (317) 233-0696 Fax: (317) 232-2554

LSA Staff:

Chuck Mayfield, Fiscal Analyst for the Committee
Chris Baker, Fiscal Analyst for the Committee
Irma Reinumagi, Attorney for the Committee
Francine Rowley, Attorney for the Committee

Authority: Legislative Council Resolution 01-02

MEETING MINUTES¹

Meeting Date: September 9, 2002
Meeting Time: 1:00 P.M.
Meeting Place: State House, 200 W. Washington St.,
Room 404
Meeting City: Indianapolis, Indiana
Meeting Number: 2

Members Present: Rep. Greg Porter, Chairperson; Rep. Duane Cheney; Rep. Clyde Kersey; Rep. Phyllis Pond; Rep. Sue Scholer; Sen. Teresa Lubbers; Sen. Kent Adams; Sen. Earline Rogers; Sen. Anita Bowser; Sen. Billie Breaux.

Members Absent: Sen. Ron Alting; Rep. Robert Hoffman.

Chairperson Porter called the meeting to order at 1:00 p.m.

Federal No Child Left Behind Statute

Chairperson Porter called on Dr. Suellen Reed, Superintendent of Public Instruction, to begin the discussion of the federal No Child Left Behind Act. The new act provides for both accountability and funding at the federal level. Indiana has performed a peer review. The review reported that Indiana was in a favorable position with respect to our standards and accountability system. Last week Dr. Reed met with the President of the United States. Dr. Reed told the Committee she was invited because of the review results and the fact that the President was impressed with Indiana's accountability system.

Elizabeth Fay, Legislative Assistant for Education Issues for Senator Evan Bayh, provided the Committee with a brief history of the federal involvement in education. The federal role primarily

¹ Exhibits and other materials referenced in these minutes can be inspected and copied in the Legislative Information Center in Room 230 of the State House in Indianapolis, Indiana. Requests for copies may be mailed to the Legislative Information Center, Legislative Services Agency, 200 West Washington Street, Indianapolis, IN 46204-2789. A fee of \$0.15 per page and mailing costs will be charged for copies. These minutes are also available on the Internet at the General Assembly homepage. The URL address of the General Assembly homepage is <http://www.ai.org/legislative/>. No fee is charged for viewing, downloading, or printing minutes from the Internet.

began in 1965 with the passage of the Elementary and Secondary Education Act (ESEA). The focus of the act was on assisting schools with the costs of educating disadvantaged students. The 1994 reauthorization of the ESEA, Improving America's Schools Act, required states to set academic standards and achievement expectations. The reauthorization also required annual testing in key grade levels to measure progress on state academic standards. The 1994 changes also required states to define a standard of progress. The 2001 reauthorization of ESEA, the No Child Left Behind Act, built on the 1994 reforms.

President Bush and Congress began the 107th session of Congress with two goals for the reauthorization of ESEA. The first goal was to create a bill which demanded greater accountability in return for greater investment and flexibility with federal funds. The second was to shift the federal role in education to include the mission of closing the academic gap. During the past decade, the achievement gap between disadvantaged and advantaged students and white students and students of color grew in more than 16 states. The performance of schools, school districts, and states will now be determined based on progress by each of the subgroups- disadvantaged, disabled, limited English proficient, and race/ethnicity. The No Child Left Behind Act consolidates several competitive grant programs into broad funding streams. Indiana's allocation from the federal government is \$7.49 million this year and \$48 million over the next six years. States and school districts are allowed to consolidate administrative funds and may transfer up to 50% of their share of Non-Title I programmatic funds into Title I or among the other streams of federal funding.

The Committee asked Ms. Fay about the difference in the 1994 and the 2001 reauthorization. Ms. Fay responded that while the 1994 reauthorization required both testing and annual progress there were no deadlines for implementation.

Jeff Zaring, Department of Education State Board Administrator, presented a powerpoint presentation (Exhibit A) discussing the analysis and implication of the No Child Left Behind Act for Indiana. During the 2002-03 school year, Title I schools may hire only highly qualified teachers and paraprofessionals, and by the end of 2005-06 every teacher and paraprofessional must be highly qualified. Mr. Zaring told the Committee that adequate yearly progress is based on assessment results, but improvement is not necessary every year. After 12 years (the 2013-14 school year), all students must reach a proficient level of achievement. He also explained that each school and each subgroup within the school must exhibit adequate yearly progress. Mr. Zaring also compared and contrasted the No Child Left Behind Act and the state achievement legislation, P.L. 221-1999. A to-do list of potential changes to the state rules and laws was presented with a tentative time frame for the changes.

The Committee asked about the implications of special education students who might not be able to be proficient in 12 years. Mr. Zaring indicated the severely handicapped should be assessed in accordance with the student's Individual Education Plan and the school could use an alternative assessment. If too many students use an alternative assessment, then the school or state may be out of compliance. In response to the Committee's question on funding, Mr. Zaring said state and federal funds are available but the resources may not be adequate.

Academic Achievement Gap

Terry Spradlin and Wes Bruce from the Department of Education presented a powerpoint presentation (Exhibit B) on the academic achievement gap in Indiana. Last year was the first year that ISTEP test information could be subgrouped. The specific subgroups are gender, ethnicity, special education, limited English proficient, and eligibility for free lunch. Mr. Spradlin and Mr. Bruce presented graphs that showed the number of students passing the ISTEP test by grade and by subgrouping. The data shows significant gaps in tests scores when the 10th grade test results are grouped by races and poverty. Mr. Spradlin told the Committee that data and analysis is the first step in closing the achievement gap. He also told the Committee that the

best decisions for closing the gap are made at the local school. Mr. Spradlin presented graphs comparing Indiana's performance on the National Assessment of Educational Progress (NAEP) and the Third International Mathematics and Science Study (TIMSS). Indiana performed well on both NAEP and TIMSS when compared to other states. Mr. Spradlin also presented information on Indiana's graduation rates, core 40 diplomas, and SAT test performance by ethnic group. He distributed an explanation (Exhibit C) of the calculation of graduation rates.

The Chair asked Mr. Spradlin to provide the Committee with a copy, Exhibit D, of his presentation to the Indiana Black Caucus Annual Conference.

The Committee asked what would reflect a significant variation in the NAEP test scores. Ms. Fay responded that a 10-point difference is approximately equal to one grade level of achievement.

Gary Wallyn, Department of Education, described the Department of Education website, www.doe.state.in.us/asap/data.html, that allows individuals to obtain achievement information by school building and school corporation. The data has been available since April 15, 2002.

The Chair distributed a copy of a paper entitled "Closing the Achievement Gap" (Exhibit E) by the National Black Caucus of State Legislators. Senator Billie Breaux told the Committee that while money does not solve all problems in education, a lack of funding can cause problems. She explained that equity and equalization are not the same thing. Indiana is one of eight states involved in a study of the closing the achievement gap. Ten town meetings are planned to develop solutions.

Closing the Achievement Gap

The Chair called on Dr. Pat Pritchett from the Indianapolis Public Schools to discuss work on closing the achievement gap. Dr. Pritchett described the corporation involvement with the National Urban Alliance and indicated the work has begun to show progress in ISTEP scores.

Eric J. Cooper, National Urban Alliance for Effective Education, told the Committee that it is important not to assume student performance based on a student's characteristics. He related a story of a child with Downs Syndrome who became a doctor. Mr. Cooper explained that learning is not complete when a student graduates from high school and all students should be prepared to go to college, if they choose to attend. In Indianapolis Public Schools, he has seen a shift in teaching designed to support life-long learning, and Mr. Cooper told the Committee that some Indianapolis schools are outpacing the suburban schools.

Dr. Yvette Jackson, National Urban Alliance for Effective Education, told the Committee the biggest difference in teaching remedial students and gifted students is expectations. She explained that reading is the "unlocking of frozen thought". It is important for the reader to be able to "get into the mind" of the author to understand the message the author is communicating. Dr. Jackson distributed information (Exhibit F) on the National Urban Alliance and their professional development model and shared the following formula for learning: Learning=(Understanding+Motivation) (Competence+Confidence).

Marilyn Zaretsky, National Urban Alliance for Effective Education, distributed information (Exhibit G) on the Vanguard project being used by the Indianapolis Public Schools. She discussed the goals of the Vanguard project and indicated that the 17 schools involved in the project have experienced an increase in the percentage of students passing the ISTEP test by over ten percent since 1998. The Vanguard project is working because of internal and external support for the project. Ms. Zaretsky explained that the project involves systemic changes in the method of teaching. The program sends classroom coaches into the classroom to coach the

teacher in the use of various materials and to observe what works and build on that success. The goal is to make the school self-sufficient by creating a cadre of experts within the school corporation to provide staff development.

The Committee asked if the program is different for elementary schools and high schools. Ms. Zaretsky responded that the program focuses on reading in grades K-2 and high school teachers are not focused as much on reading. The test for Grade 3 and Grade 6 are different, making comparisons difficult, but there is generally tremendous growth from Grade 6 to Grade 8.

Dr. Donna Ogle, International Reading Association, told the Committee that teachers need a lot of support and training. Her association has worked with the National Urban Alliance and State Reading Association. She commented that the subgrouping of the test results is important.

The meeting was adjourned at 3:20 p.m.

The next meeting date is October 7 at 1:00 p.m. in Room 404 of the State House.